

Application No. 10/016,839  
Amendment dated July 30, 2003  
Reply to Office Action dated July 7, 2003

### REMARKS/ ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-16, 18, and 19 are pending in this application. Claim 17 has been canceled because it is equivalent to claim 18.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as their invention. In particular, the Examiner requests clarification of the claims if an additional dividing step to divide the slices into lenses is not contemplated.

In the claims recited above, a plurality of glass rods are assembled into a single unit. The single unit is then cut into multiple slices, where each slice comprises an array of glass rod pieces. The slices are finished to a desired thickness and surface finish. The glass rod pieces are then extracted from the slice to produce a plurality of individual lenses. The manner in which the glass rod pieces are extracted from the slice depends on how the glass rods are assembled into the single unit. If the glass rods are held together by split rings, for example, the extracting step would involve loosening the split rings.

It is believed that the claims as amended particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as their invention. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-16, 18, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested. Claim 17 has been cancelled. Accordingly, rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is moot.

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, because the specification, while enabling for assembling a plurality of glass rods in side by side configuration, does not reasonably provide enablement for assembling a plurality of glass rods in end to end configuration. The claims have been amended as set forth above to include the limitation that the glass rods are assembled in side-by-side configuration. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-16, 18, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, is respectfully requested. Claim 17 has been cancelled. Accordingly, rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, is moot.

Application No. 10/016,839  
Amendment dated July 30, 2003  
Reply to Office Action dated July 7, 2003

FAX RECEIVED

JUL 30 2003

GROUP 1700

Conclusion

The rejected claims have been amended and/or shown to be allowable over the prior art. Applicants believe that this paper is fully responsive to each and every ground of rejection cited by the Examiner in the Office Action dated July 7, 2003, and respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

*Adenike Adewuya*

Date: 7/30/2003

Adenike A. Adewuya  
Reg. No. 42,254  
Tel.: (281) 477-3450